

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	X
	:
JOHN DOE,	:
	:
Plaintiff,	:
	:
– against –	:
	:
HOUSING SOLUTIONS OF NEW YORK, P.O.	:
JOHN DOE #1, JOHN DOE #2,	:
	:
Defendants.	:
	:
-----	X

ANN M. DONNELLY, United States District Judge:

The *pro se* plaintiff brought this action on December 10, 2024 against Housing Solutions of New York (“Housing Solutions”) and two Jane Doe employees of Housing Solutions in their official and individual capacities, alleging violations of his due process rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as well as breach of contract, negligence, false reporting, defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and “false light.” (ECF No. 1.) The plaintiff also filed a motion to proceed anonymously. (ECF No. 3.) On April 9, 2025, Magistrate Judge Cheryl L. Pollak granted the plaintiff’s motion to proceed anonymously but ordered that he file his full name, service address, and phone number under seal by May 9, 2025. (ECF No. 10.) The plaintiff did not comply, so Judge Pollak extended his deadline twice. (ECF Nos. 13, 14.) When she gave the plaintiff the second extension, Judge Pollak warned that she would recommend that the Court dismiss the case for failure to prosecute if the plaintiff did not file his contact information under seal by July 29, 2025. (ECF Nos. 13, 14.) The plaintiff did not file the information.

Accordingly, on August 15, 2025, Judge Pollak issued a *sua sponte* report and recommendation, recommending that the Court dismiss this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule

of Civil Procedure 41(b) unless the plaintiff provided his contact information by August 22, 2025 or explained why he could not do so. (ECF No. 23.) *See LeSane v. Hall's Sec. Analyst, Inc.*, 239 F.3d 206, 209 (2d Cir. 2001) (“[I]t is unquestioned that Rule 41(b) . . . gives the district court authority to dismiss a plaintiff’s case *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute.”). To date, the plaintiff has not provided his contact information under seal or otherwise communicated with the Court.

No party has filed an objection to the report and recommendation and the time for doing so has passed.

A district court reviewing a report and recommendation “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). To accept a report and recommendation to which no timely objection has been made, “a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” *VOX Amplification Ltd. v. Meussdorffer*, 50 F. Supp. 3d 355, 369 (E.D.N.Y. 2014). The Court has carefully reviewed Judge Pollak’s well-reasoned report and recommendation for clear error and finds none. Accordingly, the Court adopts the report and recommendation in its entirety. The complaint is dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

The plaintiff has not consented to electronic service of court documents, and has only provided his email address. Thus, the Court will send a copy of this Order to the email address the plaintiff listed on the signature page of the complaint.

SO ORDERED.

s/Ann M. Donnelly

ANN M. DONNELLY
United States District Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
October 6, 2025